

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-49 are pending.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,717,879, in view of Ludwig et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,802,294. These claim rejections are believed to be overcome for at least the following reasons:

An important distinction claimed in the independent claims is that the computer system performs analysis of recorded meeting data to identify one or more cues. Accordingly, each independent claim 1, 10, 23, 33, and 42 have been amended to explicitly recite this distinguishing feature.

Moran does not show this aspect of the invention. Referring to the Office Action on page 3, first paragraph, the Examiner asserted that:

“Moran teaches identifying a participant directive via accessing meeting data via button events initiated by participants during an ongoing meeting, the event indicators being color coded to identify a participant, with each button event indicative of a directive, as well as buttons and notes (i.e. a service - indicating a participant who feels something significant is being discussed) (Moran column 22 lines 1-20, Figure 13).”

The Examiner clearly states that “Moran teaches identifying a participant directive via accessing meeting data via button events initiated by participants.” Moran therefore does not teach “analyzing said recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). See also independent claims 10, 23, 33, and 42. Moreover, Moran teaches precisely the opposite of that which is recited in the pending claims, and therefore does not suggest the recited claims.

Ludwig describes techniques for combining video and audio information from multiple sources in a CMW (collaborative multimedia workstation). In column 11, line 64 and following, Ludwig describes video mosaicing to combine multiple video signals for display on a CMW. Column 12, line 55 and following discloses audio mixing that is used in conjunction with the video mosaic.


The Examiner noted that Ludwig can be combined with Moran "so that Moran can display recordings of all participants (i.e., Figures 13-15) during a session meeting." *OA, page 11, 3rd paragraph, last sentence.* However, the combination does not result in "analyzing said recorded meeting data absent direct human intervention to identify one or more cues." Neither Moran nor Ludwig describe or suggest analyzing a recorded meeting to identify such cues where the cues indicate a participant directive.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is earnestly believed all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:cmm
60536219 v1